

Corrections Standards Authority

Proposal Evaluation Process

AB 900 Phase I

Process Approved by the CSA Board and Established by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC)

- May 10, 2007 Appointment of Chair and Co-Chair of ESC
- July 12, 2007 Remainder of ESC Appointed

The ESC is charged with:

- Reviewing, developing and defining proposal evaluation criteria
- Recommending the final form of the Request for Proposals (RFP), including the timeline of key events
- Rating each of the submitted proposals
- Developing a recommended rank-ordered list of projects to be funded

ESC met on September 24, 2007

Determination of formal rating process,
including:

- Defining rating categories and weights (points)
- Grouping bidders according to specific criterion (size of jurisdiction)

Development of Draft RFP

- Using criteria developed by the ESC
- Reviewed and edited by AB 900 stakeholders: ESC, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), State Public Works Board, Attorney General's Office and Governor's Office

Dissemination of Preliminary RFP to the Field November 1, 2007

- Feedback Session held November 14, 2007 with Chair and Co-chair
- Resulted in amending the RFP

December 13, 2007

CSA Board approved:

- Final RFP, with amendments by Board
- Proposal evaluation criteria and process

December 20, 2007

Final RFP Issued to the Field

The RFP document describes what bidders must do to compete effectively for funding

Staff Provides Technical Assistance During Proposal Writing Period

- January 8, 2008 Bidders Conference held in Sacramento (Q&A)
- Frequently Asked Questions posted to CSA web
- Draft proposals were reviewed for technical compliance, if requested

Twenty-four Proposals Received by March 18, 2008

- Requesting \$1,183,588,842 of available \$750,000,000
- Staff completed technical review of all proposals based on technical criteria in RFP, including preference points
- Counties were given opportunity to correct technical deficiencies

ESC Ratings

- Members with a conflict of interest recuse themselves and state for the record that they will neither rate, vote, nor participate in discussions regarding their county that would impact the outcome of recommendations from the committee
- ESC ratings provided to counties and recommended funding list provided to CSA Board